



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,646	03/06/2001	Ranjan Prasad	50325-0508	3341

29989 7590 11/03/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

AGDEPPA, HECTOR A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2642

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

yw

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/800,646	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PRASAD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hector A. Agdeppa	<b>Art Unit</b> 2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 7/9/04. Claims 1 – 11 and 13 - 22 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 16 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 16 – 18 are recite the limitation “generating a privilege token...” However, later in each of the claims, the limitation “based on privilege information in a privilege token...” is recited. Examiner believes this was a typographical error and the second limitation should be claimed as “the privilege token...” For purposes of examination it will be assumed that in fact the second privilege token referred to is the same as the first.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1 – 4, 9 – 11, and 13 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,031,904 (An et al.)

As to claims 1 and 13, An et al. teaches a means and method for modifying a subscriber's feature profile, wherein when a subscriber desires access to/modify his/her profile, they are first validated via, for example, their directory number and PIN. Upon positive verification, the subscriber is presented with all the features/services they currently subscribe to. Note that the feature profiles are stored locally either on server 50, machine 52, as well as in profile repository 18. An et al. teaches that a subscriber may modify their profile and the locally stored profile reflects such a change, read is the first service information, and later, this information is sent to the profile repository 18 to commit the change, and the new profile is stored as the subscriber's current profile, read as the claimed second service information. It is inherent that some means for executing the modification is used, even if such means is included in the "committing" of

Art Unit: 2642

the change in profile repository 18. The modification would have no purpose unless it was actually executed. (Fig. 2, Col. 4, line 17 – Col. 5, line 34, Col. 5, line 49 – Col. 9, line 30)

Moreover, besides teaching accessing a subscriber's feature profile to modify his/her preferences, An et al. also teaches accessing his/her actual service/features. (Col. 1, lines 41 – 48)

What An et al. does not teach is the use of a privilege token, but tokens are very old and well known in the art as merely one means of effecting validation. A token can be any piece/bit of information/data used to compare data such as the aforementioned directory number and PIN with. Even in networking, as a term of art, a token is merely a set of bits that if the network recognizes, allows the data tagged with that token access to transmit/travel over the network.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a privilege token method of validation inasmuch as again, it is merely one of a plurality of well known methods of validation. Moreover, it would not affect the operation or teach away from the service provisioning aspect of An et al. inasmuch as the validation process is a separate one from the provisioning process.

An et al. also does not teach determining whether a subscriber is currently logged in and if not requiring the subscriber to log in. However, such is merely a user-convenience feature and would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to implement at the time the invention was made. Such a feature merely depends on how a subscriber uses/accesses his/her service(s). For example, on ANY webpage

Art Unit: 2642

requiring authorization to access, if a person tries to view that webpage and is not authorized or registered or logged on, a pop-up window appears or another login webpage appears. After that, any subsequent webpage residing on that server or in the hierarchy of that page or hyperlinking makeup, is accessible without further logging in. Given the use of the Internet and webpages for accessing a subscriber's profile in the system and method of An et al., such a feature would again, have been obvious.

Finally, interpreted in one manner, the term "services" as used in the claim can be read as a telephony feature, in which case, An et al. teaches accessing a plurality of features associated with any one service line the subscriber is subscribed to. (Col. 3, lines 1 – 19)

Also, the limitation "one or more" means that the existence of only one telecommunications service is needed to reject the claim, which as discussed, An et al. teaches.

Interpreted in another manner, the term "service" could be read as the actual service line (conventional, wireless, etc.) associated with the above-discussed directory number. In this instance, An et al. does not teach using a single PIN to access multiple services. However, again, such is extremely old and well known and would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to implement in An et al. at the time the invention was made. For example, one need only insert his/her card into an ATM machine and after entering a PIN, that person is given access and use to his/her checking account, savings account, etc. This same feature is and was available even

Art Unit: 2642

when ATMs were not used and people used telephones to access their account information. The same method was used except over a telephone.

Moreover, as discussed above, such a feature merely applies to user convenience and because An et al. already teaches that a subscriber may access all his/her accounts or services via one interface, albeit logging in each time using the appropriate DN, such a feature would merely require a further aggregation of accounts or services. This then is merely a question of level. At a lower level, the system of An et al. requests entry of a DN and a PIN. At another obvious, higher level, the system could ask for a userid and PIN, wherein because a userid is used, access to all that user's accounts or services is possible. Again, this is old and well known in the telephony as well as computer arts and the motivation for this is a user only has to be authorized only one time. This is convenient for both the user and the authenticating system because the systems resources are not as busy as it would be otherwise if it constantly had to authenticate users.

As to claim 2, An et al. does not teach mapping a user name to a distinguished name. Instead An et al. as discussed above, uses a user's directory number and PIN to identify that user. However, mapping names or other identifiers is also old and well known in the art and would merely be a design choice or preference for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Such a feature again, would not affect the provisioning aspect of the invention. Note that An et al. does teach using a DN name mapper 134 (Fig. 13) for properly associating a subscriber with the correct service manager and specific address. (Col. 7, lines 33 – 48)

Art Unit: 2642

Also, a subscriber in An et al. may have more than one line, i.e., a landline, a wireless subscription, pager service, local and/or long distance service, etc., read as the claimed roles.

As to claims 3 and 4, such limitations merely address the programming level aspect of the invention, i.e., object-oriented languages that would implement the profile and validation aspects of the present invention. While An et al. describes the validation on a much higher level, such would also be obvious if not inherent in An et al. inasmuch as most of the programming languages or protocols used in tele/data communications in recent years have been object-oriented and are necessary to effect the operation in computer-based systems.

As to claim 9, see the above rejection of claim 1 and note that An et al. also teaches that besides merely displaying a subscriber's current feature profile to them, the subscriber is actually "logged in" as they are able to amend each feature on their current profile. (Figs. 5 – 12 and Col. 5, lines 35 – 48)

As to claim 10, see the rejection of claims 2 – 4 above, and note that the same is applicable as well to the actual service features inasmuch as An et al. teaches that each feature that a subscriber may subscribe to, may have parameters. An et al. also teaches that a subscriber may read about his services, or others that are available to him/her, as well as being able to get descriptions regarding the cost of services, or example. (Figs. 5 – 12 and Col. 6, line 39 – Col. 9, line 20)

As to claim 11, An et al. teaches the use of a subscriber service provisioning manager (SSPM) server 122 which includes an authentication server 136, the



abovementioned DN name mapper, and a service manager adaptor 138. Such a server is read as the claimed selection gateway.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

As to claim 15, see Col. 5, lines 6 – 48 and Figs. 5 – 6, wherein An et al. teaches that personalized web pages are displayed to a subscriber with only those features that they are presently subscribed to as well as those that they may subscribe to.

As to claims 16 - 18, see the rejection of claim 1.

4. Claims 5 – 8 and 19 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,031,904 (An et al.) in view of US 6,622,016 (Sladek et al.)

As to claims 5 and 19 – 22, An et al. has been discussed above. What An et al. does not teach are group subscriptions.

However, provisioning group preferences and profiles is old and well known as is group subscriptions, or subscribers who share the same preferences. Common examples of this are business groups within a corporation or family groups, etc. Such is taught by Sladek et al. wherein a system for controlled provisioning of telecommunications services is also applicable to a group of subscribers. (Abstract, Col. 2, lines 36 – 46, Col. 3, lines 8 - 21, Col. 17, lines 16 – 28 of Sladek et al.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have allowed for groups inasmuch as they are old and well known and would only affect the relational aspect of subscribers. Instead of providing

service to one subscriber, it would be to a group of subscribers, linked in some manner in the profile repository 18 of An et al.

Moreover, it is inherent that some administrator or head affect changes for the group and of course, as discussed above, would have to be validated as well. Even if all the members of a group could make changes to the group subscription, each of the members then could be considered administrators, because to be an administrator, one need only have the ability to administrate, in this example, over service features.

As to claim 6, see the rejection of claim 2 and note that such would be inherent or at the least, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. A group would merely be considered to be another subscriber, except, as discussed above, there would be some manner of linking the group members so that the feature profile for the group would affect all the members.

As to claims 7 and 8, see the rejection of claims 3 and 4.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to applicant's first argument, it has been addressed above in the rejection.

As to applicant's second argument, see again the above rejection and note that it is extremely old and well known to have multiple user lines such as dorm rooms or in certain residences or offices. Each user has access to his/her own account which utilizes one DN.

As to applicant's argument regarding the privilege token, again examiner maintains that the use of privilege tokens are obvious. Privilege tokens are a known method of authentication. The suggestion in An et al. that examiner relies on is the fact that An et al. implements an authentication procedure.

As to applicant's argument regarding the term "role," although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As to applicant's argument regarding the authentication server and authorization service, as a term of art, authentication and authorization are used nearly if not always interchangeably. This is because the only applications where authentication is needed in the telephony arts is to authorize someone or something. Authentication suggests the need to verify and there would be no issue of verification if someone or something did not need authorized access to someone or something else. Moreover, nothing in the claim language suggests that examiner cannot read the authorization service as merely being a description of the functionality performed by the authentication server. Again, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As to applicant's argument regarding claim 9 and the accessing of services, see the rejection of claim 1 and note that An et al. does not merely teach accessing a profile to modify services or features, but also to access and use those services or features.

As to applicant's arguments regarding claim 5, again see the rejection above.

As to applicant's argument regarding the host object, again, objects are old and well known in the programming arts. Moreover, the term host object is a term that is used simply to describe that a token is associated with a subscriber. If it is a subscriber that must be authenticated then of course a privilege token must be associated with that subscriber, and in an object-oriented environment, such a host object would be inherent. Even taken out of the object-oriented environment, the host object is still merely a software or elemental representation of a subscriber within the system so that any information related to that subscriber may be known or transmitted, etc. This idea is not novel in the telephony arts.

As to applicant's argument regarding claim 11, see again examiner's response to the authentication and authorization argument above.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5,206,899 (Gupta et al.) teaches an arrangement for outbound telecommunications wherein a user may personalize any target telephone to use the features of that user's regular telephone, and wherein that user has access to his/her services and profiles as well. US 6,018,570 (Matison) teaches methods and apparatus for regulating the remote ordering, authorization, access and control or services and service features associated with a terminal. US 6,160,877 (Tatchell et al.) teaches a method of screening and prioritizing an incoming call wherein access is given

Art Unit: 2642

to a subscriber's profile as well as to his/her services from different telephony units and networks.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hector A. Agdeppa whose telephone number is 703-305-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Fri 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 703-305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H.A.A.  
October 28, 2004



AHMAD MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600